

Remarks:

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for discussing the previous rejections in this case. As discussed with the Examiner on November 24, 2003, the above claims are believed to be allowable. Claims 1-15 are in this case. Claims 1 has been amended to emphasize that the inventive structure is an electronic attenuator circuit comprising two or more ports, including input, output, and common terminals connected to the thermistors. In dependent claim 11, the term "filter" has been replaced by the "attenuator" to correct a clerical error. New dependent claims 12 and 13 claim the use of the inventive attenuator in cascaded compensation circuit topologies as explained on page 1 at lines 14-18. New dependent claim 14 calls for at least one of the thermistors of the inventive attenuator structure to have a different temperature coefficient (TC) than another thermistor in the attenuator, according to the technique explained on page 1 at lines 22-24. New dependent claim 15 calls for at least one of the thermistors of the inventive attenuator structure to have a positive TC while another thermistor in the attenuator has a negative TC, according to the technique explained on page 1 at lines 22-24, page 5, lines 4-11, and at page 6, lines 1-6.

The applicant discloses and claims an at least two port attenuator comprising a plurality of thermistors embedded within the substrate, at least one of which is a sheet thermistor. The attenuator has at least three terminals including an input, output, and a common terminal. The terminals are connected to thermistors thus forming the components of the attenuator.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Prior art of record fails to teach or suggest such an attenuator having a plurality of thermistors embedded within the substrate at least one of which is a sheet thermistor, forming the components of the attenuator. And, the attenuator has at least three terminals including an input, output, and a common terminal as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, the two port attenuator comprising a plurality of thermistors, at least one of which is a sheet thermistor, is neither anticipated by or obvious in view of the prior art of record.

It is believed that the application now complies with all aspects of 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103 and is in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph M. Geller
Reg. No. 48,144
Attorney for Applicants

January 8, 2004
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, New Jersey 07068
Tel.: 973-597-6162